	Case 1:21-cv-00890-NODJ-SKO Docume	ent 34 Filed 01/09/24	Page 1 of 2
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	JORGE ARVIZU, individually and as successor-in-interest to KRYSTAL LEE	No. 1:21-cv-00890-1	NODJ-SKO
12 13	ARVIZU aka KRYSTAL LEE CHURCH, Plaintiff,	ODDED CDANTIN	G LEAVE TO AMEND
13 14	·	(Doc. 33)	G LEAVE TO AMEND
15	v. CITY OF FRESNO, a Municipal entity;	(Doc. 33)	
16	FRANCIS HAMMON, an individual; ANTHONY ALVARADO, an individual;		
17	and DOES 1-5, inclusive,		
18	Defendants.		
19			
20	On January 8, 2024, the parties filed a stipulation (Doc. 33), presumably pursuant to Fed		
21	R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1)(A)(ii), to dismiss Plaintiff's second cause of action for municipal liability under		
22	Monell v. Department of Social Services of the City of New York, 436 U.S. 658 (1978) withou		
23	prejudice. (Doc. 33). However, Rule 41 does not permit dismissal of part of the claims against a		
24	party. <i>United States v. Hill</i> , No. 2:17-CV-608-MCE-EFB, 2020 WL 5502327, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Sept		
25	11, 2020), report and recommendation adopted, No. 2:17-CV-00608 MCE EFB, 2020 WI		
26	6158232 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 21, 2020) ("Rule 41 does not permit a party to dismiss some but not all o		

its claims. Instead, a party is required to seek leave of the court to amend the complaint to eliminate

one or more, but less than all, of its claims under Rule 15."). See also Hells Canyon Pres. Council

27

28

v. U.S. Forest Serv., 403 F.3d 683, 687-88 (9th Cir. 2005) (affirming the district court by construing the Rule 41 dismissal as granting leave to amend to remove the claims in question); Ethridge v. Harbor House Rest., 861 F.2d 1389, 1392 (9th Cir. 1988). Thus, the Court construes the parties' stipulation as an unopposed motion seeking leave to amend under Rule 15. Given that leave should be freely given, and that the parties stipulated to removing the claim, the Court GRANTS leave to amend. Although the Court approves the parties' stipulation as it relates to the filing of an amended pleading, for the purposes of docket management, operative pleadings must be filed on the docket separately. Thus, Plaintiff must file their Second Amended Complaint on or before February 9, 2024. The Court will not deem it filed without action by the Plaintiff. IT IS SO ORDERED. Isl Sheila K. Oberto Dated: January 9, 2024 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Case 1:21-cv-00890-NODJ-SKO Document 34 Filed 01/09/24 Page 2 of 2